Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

ENF

Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

EOEA No.: 12831
MEPA Analyst: Bill Gage
Phone: 617-626-1025

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Chapoquoit Beach Replenishment, Falmouth, MA		
Street: Chapoquoit Road		
Municipality: Falmouth, MA	Watershed: Cape Cod	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates: 362294.2, 4607155 to 362704.2, 4606160	Latitude: 70.65253W to 70.64738W Longitude: 41.60423N to 41.59534N	
Estimated commencement date: Oct. 2002	Estimated completion date: Dec. 2002	
Approximate cost: $1,000,000	Status of project design: 70% complete	
Proponent: Chapoquoit Associates		
Street: Associates Road		
Municipality: West Falmouth	State: MA	Zip Code: 02540
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Leslie Fields		
Firm/Agency: Woods Hole Group, Inc.	Street: 81 Technology Park Drive	
Municipality: East Falmouth	State: MA	Zip Code: 02536
Phone: (508) 540-8080	Fax: (508) 540-1001	E-mail: lfields@whgrp.com

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?
☒ Yes ☐ No

Has this project been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EOEA No._____) ☒ No

Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EOEA No._____) ☒ No

Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting:

a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8))	☐ Yes	☐ No
a Special Review Procedure? (see 301CMR 11.09)	☐ Yes	☐ No
a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	☒ Yes	☐ No
a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	☐ Yes	☐ No

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): Not applicable

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
☒ Yes (Specify USACE, EPA, F&W, NMFS, DEP, Falmouth Conservation Commission, CZM) ☐ No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Town of Falmouth Order of Conditions, MA DEP

Chapter 91 Permit, MA DEP 401 Water Quality Certification, USACE Individual Permit, and MCZM Consistency Statement.

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- ☐ Land
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ ACEC
- ☐ Rare Species
- ☐ Wastewater
- ☐ Air
- ☐ Regulations
- ☒ Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Solid & Hazardous Waste
- ☐ Historical & Archaeological Resources

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage	6.23		
New acres of land altered		6.07	
Acres of impervious area	0	0	0
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		537,500 sq. ft.	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	0	0	0
Number of housing units	0	0	0
Maximum height (in feet)	0	0	0
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	0	0	0
Parking spaces	0	0	0
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	0	0	0
GPD water withdrawal	0	0	0
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	0	0	0
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	0	0	0

State Permits & Approvals

- ☒ Order of Conditions
- ☐ Superseding Order of Conditions
- ☐ Chapter 91 License
- ☒ 401 Water Quality Certification
- ☐ MHD or MDC Access Permit
- ☐ Water Management Act Permit
- ☐ New Source Approval
- ☐ DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit
- ☒ Other Permits (*including Legislative Approvals*) – Specify:

Chapter 91 Permit

MCZM Consistency Statement

CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?

☐ Yes (Specify_____) ☒ No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒No See attached maps

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒No

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒No

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include **(a)** a description of the project site, **(b)** a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and **(c)** potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (*You may attach one additional page, if necessary.*)

The Chapoquoit Beach replenishment project in West Falmouth, MA is being proposed by the Chapoquoit Associates Homeowners Association, in cooperation with the Town of Falmouth, Bowerman's Beach Club and other local residents. The primary purposes for the project are to improve storm damage protection and flood control for public and private infrastructure, to enhance the eroding coastal beach and dune ecosystem, and to improve public and private access to the shoreline. The project site contains a number of wetland resource areas including coastal beach, coastal dune, barrier beach, land under the ocean, rocky intertidal shore, and coastal bank.

The proposed replenishment project extends for approximately 3,630 ft from Chapoquoit Point to the northern end of Black Beach (Section 2.0 – Locus Map). A total volume of 100,000 to 125,000 cubic yards of sand will be required to construct the project. The replenishment design template calls for a +8 ft NGVD berm, starting at that elevation along the landward side of the beach (coastal bank, seawall, or dune), and extending seaward for 60 ft. The replenishment will then continue seaward at a 10H:1V slope to meet with the natural grade. The average fill volume will be 20 cubic yards per linear foot of beach. Sandy material for the project will be obtained from either the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) dredging of the Cape Cod Canal, or from an upland source. The preferred alternative is to beneficially use sandy material dredged from the Canal for the Chapoquoit replenishment project; however, permits for an alternate upland source also are being requested.

If the material is obtained from the USACE dredging, it will be placed on the beach hydraulically. The only exception to this is along the northern 500 feet of the project area where the sand will be placed using front-end loaders. The front-end loaders will push sand from the pumped portion of the beach toward the northern terminus of the project. This method of sand placement will serve

as a mitigation measure to protect eelgrass and rocky intertidal shore resources. If an upland source is chosen for replenishment of the beach rather than the USACE sand, then the entire beach will be placed using front-end loaders.

A number of alternatives were investigated for controlling the on-going beach erosion. These included groins, breakwaters, seawalls/revetments, beach dewatering, nearshore berms, vegetation, and beach replenishment. The preferred alternative of beach replenishment was selected due to its ability to provide additional sediment to the littoral system. While many of the other alternatives can be designed to help stabilize and build a beach, they can also have adverse impacts on adjacent shores, and are not preferred at this site. The beach replenishment project alternative also has desirable recreational benefits.

Several important design considerations have been incorporated into the proposed project to ensure protection of the natural resources. These include construction windows designed to protect finfish and shellfish, tapering at the ends of the nourishment footprint to minimize spreading, and strict construction management criteria designed to monitor the progress of the project. In addition, placement of sand at the northern end of the project site will be done mechanically rather than hydraulically. This will serve to protect rocky intertidal shore and offshore eel grass resources.

The proposed project exceeds the Wetlands, Waterways and Tidelands MEPA Review Thresholds 301 CMR 11.03 (3)(a)1.b.,(3)(b) 1.a.3., (3)(b) 1.c., and (3)(b) 4., and, therefore, triggers a Mandatory EIR and the filing of an ENF. As allowed in 301 CMR 11.05(7) an Expanded ENF has been prepared to demonstrate the significant amount of data collection and analyses completed for this project. This Expanded ENF demonstrates there will be no significant adverse impacts associated with the proposed project. The applicant feels that preparation of an EIR would not serve to minimize or avoid damage to the environment as numerous precautions and design changes have been incorporated into the project to minimize adverse impacts. As such, a waiver from the Mandatory EIR as allowed under 301 CMR 11.11 is being requested.

LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **land** (see 301 CMR 11.03(1)
___ Yes _X__ No; if yes, specify each threshold:

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

	Existing	Change	Total
Footprint of buildings	0	0	0
Roadways, parking, and other paved areas	0	0	0
Other altered areas (describe)	0	0	0
Undeveloped areas	6.23 acres	6.07 acres	12.3 acres

B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years?
___ Yes _X__ No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use?

C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use?
___ Yes _X__ No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan:

as a mitigation measure to protect eelgrass and rocky intertidal shore resources. If an upland source is chosen for replenishment of the beach rather than the USACE sand, then the entire beach will be placed using front-end loaders.

A number of alternatives were investigated for controlling the on-going beach erosion. These included groins, breakwaters, seawalls/revetments, beach dewatering, nearshore berms, vegetation, and beach replenishment. The preferred alternative of beach replenishment was selected due to its ability to provide additional sediment to the littoral system. While many of the other alternatives can be designed to help stabilize and build a beach, they can also have adverse impacts on adjacent shores, and are not preferred at this site. The beach replenishment project alternative also has desirable recreational benefits.

Several important design considerations have been incorporated into the proposed project to ensure protection of the natural resources. These include construction windows designed to protect finfish and shellfish, tapering at the ends of the nourishment footprint to minimize spreading, and strict construction management criteria designed to monitor the progress of the project. In addition, placement of sand at the northern end of the project site will be done mechanically rather than hydraulically. This will serve to protect rocky intertidal shore and offshore eel grass resources.

The proposed project exceeds the Wetlands, Waterways and Tidelands MEPA Review Thresholds 301 CMR 11.03 (3)(a)1.b.,(3)(b) 1.a.3., (3)(b) 1.c., and (3)(b) 4., and, therefore, triggers a Mandatory EIR and the filing of an ENF. As allowed in 301 CMR 11.05(7) an Expanded ENF has been prepared to demonstrate the significant amount of data collection and analyses completed for this project. This Expanded ENF demonstrates there will be no significant adverse impacts associated with the proposed project. The applicant feels that preparation of an EIR would not serve to minimize or avoid damage to the environment as numerous precautions and design changes have been incorporated into the project to minimize adverse impacts. As such, a waiver from the Mandatory EIR as allowed under 301 CMR 11.11 is being requested.

LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **land** (see 301 CMR 11.03(1)
___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, specify each threshold:

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

	Existing	Change	Total
Footprint of buildings	0	0	0
Roadways, parking, and other paved areas	0	0	0
Other altered areas (describe)	0	0	0
Undeveloped areas	6.23 acres	6.07 acres	12.3 acres

B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years?
___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use?

C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use?
___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan: